I N D E X Of WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Page
Morosov, Planton Dmitrievich	7651
Direct by Colonel Ivanov	7651
Cross by Mr. Mattice	7654
KAWABE, Torashiro	7672
Direct by Colonel Ivanov	7672
Cross by Dr. KIYOSE " " Mr. MIYATA " " Hr. Furness	7679 7683 7688

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros.	Def. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
732-A	1	Excerpt from Exhibit 732		7658
733		Minutes of Interrogation of Accused MATSUI, Iwane	7643	
733-A		Excerpt therefrom	*	7643

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Pros. Def.		or	In Evidence
No. No.	Description	eno	DVIGORO
734	Photocopy of a report entitled: "Situation in the Caucasia and its Stragetic Use for the Purpose of Sabotage Activities"	647	
734-A	Excerpt therefrom		7647
735	Supplemental Note of Pro- test of the Soviet Embassy in Japan		7660
736	"Revision of the Anti-Soviet Sab Activities and of Guidance of White Russians in Keep- ing with the Revisions"	otage 7661	
.736-A	Excerpt therefrom		7662
737	"Instructions Pertaining to the Sabotage Activities for Education and Training for the 18th Year Showa (1943)		7664
738	Directions in Relation to the Guidance of the White Russians dated June 1943 (Second Intelligence Con- ference 1943 of the Kwan- tung Army Intelligence Department		7664
739	Plan for Currying out the Train ing of White Russian Youths in the Special Immigration Settlements, Kharbin Special Service Agency		7665

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Pros. I	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
740	"The Principles of the Japanese Propaganda Campaign Against Outer Mongolia		7667
741	Affidavit of KAWABE, Torashiro		7673
742	Affidavit of KAWABE, Torashiro (in the Japanese language)		7676
743	Affidavit of AKIKUSA, Shun	,	7708
744	Extract from the record of the Talk between Litvinov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the USSF and the Japanese Foreign Minister YOSHIZAWA which took place 31 Dec 1931	R	7714
745	Text of UCHIDA's note handed over to the Soviet Am- bassador Troyanovsky		7719
746	Note delivered by the Soviet Government on 4 January 1933 to the Japanese Government		7720
747	Text of note delivered on 13 February 1933 by order of UCHIDA		7727

Monday, 14 October, 1946 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL 4 FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 5 Tokyo, Japan 6 7 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 8 at 0930. 9 10 11 12 13 Appearances: For the Tribunal, same as before. 14 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 15 For the Defense Section, same as before. 16 17 18 19 (English to Japanese, Japanese to 20 English, Russian to English and Japanese to 21 Russian interpretation was made by the 22 Language Section, IMTFE.) 23 24 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session and ready to hear any matter brought before it.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Rosenblit.

(Whereupon, Colonel Ivanov approached the lectern.)

October 11, at the end of the afternoon session,
I submitted for identification prosecution document
No. 4107; Minutes of Interrogation of accused, MATSUI,
Iwane. This document has not been accepted by the
Tribunal.

No. 4107 will receive exhibit No. 733 for identification.

("hereupon, the document above referred
to was marked prosecttion's exhibit No. 733 for
identification.)

COLONEL IVANOV: I submit in evidence excerpts from this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The excerpts from document 4107 will receive exhibit No. 733-A.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 733-A and was received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: I quote interrogation of the accused MATSUI of April 25, 1946, page two, paragraph three:

"Q. "hat decisions were accepted in the conference of the Japanese military attaches in Europe, called in Berlin in 1929?

"A. In 1929, I, in my capacity of director of the second department of the General Staff, was in America and Europe. During my stay in Berlin, I called a conference of all the military attaches of Japan in European countries. At the conference we considered various current problems. "e didn't touch on any political problems at the conference."

I quote page three, last paragraph:

"Q. Did HASHINOTO participate in the deliberations of that conference?

"A. Yes, HASHIMOTO, being at that time military attache in Turkey, participated in the deliberations of that conference."

I quote page four, paragraphs one and two:

"O. A document is being shown to you which is a photo-copy of notes concerning the work of the conference of military attaches in Berlin in 1929. "ere questions given in the document considered at the conference?

,

"(A photo-copy of the said document is being shown.)

"A. Having read the document shown to
me, I have come to the conclusion that the notes
were made by one of the persons who were present
at the conference and apparently reflect correctly
the contents of some of the questions which were
considered at the conference."

If the Tribunal please, I shall now deal with the prosecution document No. 1682, exhibit No. 732. I shall quote in evidence an excerpt from this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, Friday document No. 1682 was marked 732 for identification. It was objected to on the ground it was not properly proven that the attaches at this conference had discussed these matters and in order to prove its case further, prosecution offered this document this morning, 4107, exhibit 733-A. In reading the interrogation of MATSUI, it appears that a document was shown to him which he identified, but there is nothing on document 1682, 732 for identification, which shows that that was the document that was shown to him.

1 2 3

THE PRESIDENT: That means that we should have evidence on oath here, or by affidavit or otherwise, from the person who took or who made the interrogation.

4

IF. LOGAN: That is right, your Honor.

6

THE PRESIDENT: That is your opinion.

7

PR. LOCAN: In other words, the document is not properly proven.

9

8

THE PRESIDENT: "e will hear Colonel Ivanov

10

first, or Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please,

11 12

we will put on the stand the man who questioned

13

MATSUI, Iwane, and who had shown him the document.

14

THE PRESIDENT: Are you going to put him

15

on the stand now?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GOLUNSKY: I think he will be here in five minutes. If the Tribunal please, we might proceed now with the document if the Tribunal would agree to accept it conditionally now.

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead with something else in the meantime.

COLONEL IVANOV: I present for identification prosecution document No. 1989, the photo-copy of a report entitled, "Situation in the Caucasia and its Strategic Use for the Purpose of Sabotage Activities."

No. 1989 will receive exhibit No. 734.

No. 1989 will receive exhibit No. 734.

("Thereupon, the document above referred

to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 734

for identification.)

COLONEL IVANOV: As it is shown in this document it was written on November 15, 1929, Register No. 5, by the then Major HASMINOTO, Japanese Military Attache in Istanbul, whose seal is on the document, and addressed to General OKALOTO, Assistant Chief of the Japanese General Staff. I quote in evidence one excerpt from this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF TUE COURT: The excerpt from

prosecution's document No. 1989 will receive exhibit

No. 734-A.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 734-A and was received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: In his report HASHIMOTO, Kingoro, wrote: I quote paragraph one on page one:

"The Caucasus area, various in race and religion, is affected little by Russian civilization, being located far from the center of Soviet Russia.

Considering this, the Caucasus is surely an important

area from the standpoint of strategens against
Russia. Fowever, because of the fact that the various
races in the area are antagonistic to each other
and can not cooperate in doing anything, we cannot
deny that it will be very difficult to unite the
whole Caucasus in rising against Russia unless by
the force of military occupation."

I shall not inconvenience the Tribunal by quoting further from this lengthy document in which HASHIMOTO worked out a system of concrete acts of political sabotage "to make all races in the Caucasus confront each other and consequently to bring confusion in the area." Besides, HASHIMOTO in this document lays the foundation for the designs of Japanese militarists on seizing the Caucasus "by means of methods of military occupation" together with some other countries bordering on the U.S.S.R.

IR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, we think that a stop should be made to this, to the prosecution commenting and quoting something which is not in evidence. This has been going on since the latter part of last week and it is contrary to your Honor's order that when they read paragraphs they should not introduce them with their comments.

1R. FURNESS: Furthermore, if your Honor

Mark of

please, in this case it was not mere comment. It was a direct quotation from something which is not in evidence at all and we feel that it should be stricken.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, I think that because there is some --were we to submit in evidence the whole of the document then we will have to distribute the English translation to the defense in one or two days.

MR. McManus: If your Honor pleases, we realize that the Russian prosecution has prepared their case rather diligently and everything has been prepared because of language difficulties to be presented and so that it may be properly presented to the Court and through the language section; however, because they have done that, it should not militate against us for the purposes of expediency. After the opening statement by the Russian prosecutor just last week, in the face of some document being introduced, the associate prosecutor said in summation, just as an opening remark -- it is the prosecutor testifying himself, your Honor. "e resent it and we object to it. I should like to request the Tribunal to instruct the prosecution henceforth just to confine themselves to the offering of documents without any lengthy

24

25

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

explanation or summation.

2

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

explanation of summation,

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal has at no time allowed a prosecutor to testify from the lectern, that is to say, to make statements of fact without proving them. Some days ago we allowed the Russian prosecutor a little grace to reduce comments which he was making and which he had prepared and which were based on evidence which he submitted or which he proposed to submit. The statement made this morning by the Russian prosecutor from the lectern and which is objected to exceeded the bounds of fair comment. It extended to matters of fact which there is no intention of establishing because no preparations have been made to establish those facts or are they contemplated. To the extent the observations of the Russian prosecutor exceed the evidence adduced and exceed the bounds of fair comment, they will be disregarded. The objection is upheld to that extent.

Colonel Rosenblit.

COLONEL IVANOV: I ask the Tribunal to call in court as witness Colonel Morosov to testify that the said document, No. 1682, had been presented for identification to MATSUI, Iwane, during the interrogation of the latter.

3.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PLATON DMITRIEVICH MOROSOV,

called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution,

being first duly sworn testified as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: I wish to call attention to the Court that the witness apparently has been sworn under the Soviet oath. It seems to us that he should be sworn under the oath of this Court.

THE PRESIDENT: No, the Charter allows what was done and if the Charter did not, we would allow it in any event. The witness is to select what form is binding on him. That is the common law of my country; I think it is of all countries. The Charter expressly covers this case.

Yes.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY COLONEL IVANOV:

- Q Give your full name.
- A Morosov, Platon Dmitrievich.
- O How old are you?
- A Forty years old.
- ? "hat position do you hold at the present?
- A I am military interrogator of the Soviet Section of the IPS here in Tokyo.
 - o Did you take part in the interrogation of

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MATSUI, Iwane, on April 25 this year? Yes, on 25th of April, 1946, at Sugamo Prison I interrogated MATSUI, Iwane. Did military interrogator, Colonel Baginyan interrogate MATSUI, Iwane at that time also? Yes, military interrogator Colonel Baginyan also conducted the interrogation of MATSUI, Iwane, and the document is signed by him. "here is Colonel Baginyan at the present? Ç A As far as we know he is in Moscow.

20

21 22

23

24

Goldberg & Spratt

Q Mr. Witness, please look at this document.

This is document No. 1682, Items Concerning the U.S.S.R.

Presented at the Conference of Japanese Military

Attaches in Europe. Please tell the Court, is this
a document which has been submitted to MATSUI? Was
this document presented to MATSUI, Iwane, and did he
read its contents?

A Having considered this document now, I can tell you that this document was presented during the interrogation. It has been presented to MATSUI, Iwane, in April, 1946.

Q Now the defense may cross-examine the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Show him first exhibit No. 733A, and ask him whether that is the interrogation to which he refers or a record of it. There may have been more than one interrogation in April.

COLONEL IVANOV: I quoted the title of the document 1682 to the Tribunal and I presented this document to the witness.

O Mr. Witness, tell the Tribunal was this interrogation of April 25th signed by you and other persons who took part in the interrogation? Is this the same minutes of the interrogation?

A Yes, the minutes of the interrogation which were presented to me right now were signed by me and

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

25

by other persons who had taken part in the interrogation.

Q Is this the same document in which it is said that the document No. 1682 had been presented to the accused MATSUI?

A As I came to know now, the number of the submitted document is not in the minutes of the interrogation. However, it is said in the minutes of the interrogation that the same document which has been presented to me here in the Court was submitted to the accused MATSUI, the document which is about -- which refers to the record of the conference of the Japanese military attaches in certain European countries which was held on April, 1929 in Berlin.

colonel IVANOV: I finish the direct examination by this question, and if the defense wish, they can cross-examine the witness now.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Mattice.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MATTICE:

Q I understand you are connected with the

I. P. S. In addition to the capacity which you mentioned,
do you hold any other office or position with the I. P.

S.?

A I repeat that I am military interrogator of

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Soviet part of the I. P. S., International Military Tribunal in Tokyo.

THE PRESIDENT: He is military interrogator of the Russian prosecution here.

Q Was this interrogation about which you have spoken the only interrogation of the accused MATSUI?

A If my memory doesn't fail me, it was the only interrogation of the accused MATSUI. However, certain accused were interrogated during several days, and now that half a year has passed already, I can't remember exactly how long did the interrogation of MATSUI last.

Q My question, Mr. Witness, was not how long did the interrogation last, but whether you interrogated him on other occasions than the one you mentioned.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he said he could not recollect any other. So leave it at that.

Q On the occasion when this interrogation took place -- strike that, please.

Do you speak Japanese, Mr. Witness?

A No, I don't speak Japanese.

Q An interpreter was used then in the conduct of this interrogation?

A Yes. The interregation of MATSUI was conducted in Japanese. The interpretation was done by Junior

3

Lieutenant Petrov.

Q Who acted as interpreter on this case?

THE PRESIDENT: He said so. This is hardly important. The American interrogators use Japanese interpreters.

MR. MATTICE: That is not the purpose of the question, if the Court please.

Q I will ask you, Mr. Witness, if the accused MATSUI was not interrogated on three occasions, on the first two of which a male interpreter served as interpreter, and on the third a female acted as interpreter?

A I repeat that in order to give precise information I must get, acquainted with all the documents
which concern this case in order to establish the
number and date in order to give precise answer to
your question.

MR. MATTICE: I don't know whether it is the system or not, but I was unable to hear the answer in English.

THE PRESIDENT: He said he would have to read all the documents to answer, that is what he meant.

Q On the occasion of this interview that you have testified about, did MATSUI hand to you a written

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

23

statement?

A I don't understand the question because of bad interpretation. Please repeat it.

Q Did MATSUI, in addition to answering your questions, hand to you a written statement?

A Yes. As far as I remember, MATSUI, according to the request of the interrogator, wrote a page or several pages and --

MR. MATTICE: It doesn't come through, if the Court please.

A (Continuing): and a copy of the notes should be included in the minutes of the interrogation.

These notes were in regard to his ideas of Greater

East Asia and what it should be; and they had nothing to do with the question of identification of the document which had been presented to him.

THE PRESIDENT: May I tell you what he said?

He just told you that MATSUI gave him some notes about

Greater East Asia having no bearing on this matter.

MR. MATTICE: That is all, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no further cross-examination apparently.

MR. GOLUNSKY: No redirect.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

COLONEL IVANOV: If the Tribunal please, I
shall read in evidence extracts from the document
1682, exhibit No. 732.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

Do you propose to read from a document already
in evidence?

COLONEL IVANOV: Yes. This document had been earlier submitted by me for identification. Now I shall read an excerpt from this document in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 1682 was given exhibit No. 732 for identification.
The excerpt therefrom, bearing the same number, will
be given exhibit No. 732-A.

COLONEL IVANOV: In the first part under the title "Investigation of Situations" I shall quote the following paragraphs from page 1, top page:

"A study of sabotage measures to be taken by various European countries in case of war with the U.S.S.R.

"4. A survey of the conditions and future activity of white Russians in foreign countries.

"5. Views on the effect on Soviet-European relations, if in the future JAPAN should end friendly relations with the U.S.S.R."

3

6

7

9

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22 23

24 25 From the second part under the title "Miscellaneous Items" I quot the second paragraph.

"2. Opinions on intelligence work against the U.S.S.R. conducted by Japanese military attaches stationed outside the U.S.S.R."

My colleague in prosecution, Mr. Tavenner, has already presented to the Tribunal a document showing that OSHIMA, being Japanese Ambassador in Berlin, discussed with Hitler concrete sabotage and terrorist measures which he was carrying out against the Soviet Union.

My other colleague in prosecution, Major General Tadevosyan, will offer in evidence a number of verdicts announced by Soviet courts, who every year heard many cases of sabotage acts prepared and carried out by Japanese agents on the Soviet Union territory.

I tender in evidence prosecution document No. 2307, the supplemental note of protest of the Soviet Embassy in Japan. The document has been presented to show that the Soviet Government protested against the hostile activities of the Japanese military authorities in Manchuria.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COUPT: Prosecution document

No. 2307 will receive exhibit No. 735.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 735 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: I quote the document from the beginning of the first page:

(Reading): "Numerous facts of intolerable anti-Soviet activities of the Japanese military authorities of Manchuria which are absolutely contradictory to article 5 of the Peking Convention concluded between the USSR and Japan on January 20, 1925, have repeatedly been brought to the notice of the Japanese Imperial government. Below are given new facts which show that these activities have lately been carried on on a larger scale and that intense sabotage work in the USSR has been organized on the territory of Manchuria.

"The Japanese military authorities often make use of the Russian whiteguard emigrants living in Manchuria for their anti-Soviet activities, using them directly or indirectly for committing terroristic and sabotage acts on the USSR territory, smuggling them for this purpose to the USSR, etc."

Now I shall present evidence of the fact that in spite of all these notices the Japanese

Elia Tapan pala misari alia pana nyaona ilika matana bisari

war a content of the continue of the

authorities contined to carry on activities hostile towards the Soviet Union.

I present for identification prosecution's document No. 1968. The document is entitled, "Revision of the Anti-Societ Sabotage Activities and of Guidance of White Russians in Keeping with the Revisions."

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 1988 will receive exhibit No. 736.

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: Correction: Document No. 1968.

No. 1968 will receive exhibit No. 736 for identification.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 736 for identification.)

the material of the conference of Japanese chiefs of military organs in Northern Manchuria called in Harbin on February 16 and 17, 1940. The document was drawn up by the military mission in Harbin, and is dated February 16, 1940. I shall read in evidence several excerpts from this document, from which it is seen that the changes in sabotage work directed against U. S. S. R. were necessary to make the work

more effective.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The excerpt from prosecution's document 1968 will receive exhibit No. 736-A.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 736-A and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: I shall duote an extract from the first page of this document proving the above. I duote the first paragraph, page 1:

"Reform of the anti-Soviet sabotage activities. The idea we have hitherto had regarding the anti-Soviet sabotage activities was to use the individual sabotage units under the direct leadership of the Japanese military authorities. However, to make this more effective in future, it is advantageous to establish a Fer East Anti-Comintern Self-government simultaneously with the commencement of hostilities, to unite various 'inds of sabotage activities by this, and to add political meanings to this."

Item I of the section reads, paragraphs 2 and 3 on page 1 -- on page 2, I quote:

"Part I -- is to appoint White Russians in important posts of the present administrative and economic systems and to make them undertake

practical business. Considering these practical businesses, it is necessary to appoint them on responsible posts and not to confine them to such robot-like beings as former Russian public officials or company employees in Manchuria. For this purpose, special appointments must be opened for them to some extent.

where the White Russians could be used: at least,
every local administrative and self-governing systems,
military authorities, railway, other special companies,
etc., under the province, and it is required to assign
necessary personnel to all parts, and to engage them
in practical businesses of military affairs, police
affairs, economy, industry, traffic, correspondence,
propagation, judicature, etc."

Now we shall present to the Tribunal proceedings of the Second Conference of the Kwantung Army Information Department called in Harbin on June 16, 1943. As the document shows, this conference was conducted by Major General Doi, Chief of the Information Department. We shall prove by this document that the war of sabotage against the U. S. S. R. was continued by Japan even in 1943, when Japan had already been bound with the U. S. S. R. by the Neutrality Pact.

.

We shall offer in evidence four documents
dated June 16, 1943, which I request to admit on the
usual terms: First, prosecution's document No. 1962,
under the title of "Instructions Pertaining to the
Sabotage Activities for Education and Training for
the Year of Showa (1943)."

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 1962 will receive exhibit No. 737.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 737 and received in evidence.)

ment No. 1956, under the title of "The Directions in Relation to the Guidance of the White Russians."

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1956 will receive exhibit No. 738.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 738 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: Third, prosecution document No. 1971, under title of "Plan for Carrying out the Training of White Russian Youths in the Special Immigration Settlements. Kharbin Special Service

Agency."

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1971 will receive exhibit No. 739.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 739 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: Fourth, document No. 1957, under the title of "The Principles of the Japanese Propaganda Campaign against Outer Mongolia. Related to the Second Conference of Intelligence Section in 1943. Published by the Intelligence Section of the Kwantung Army."

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I object to the admission of document No. 1957 on the ground that any plans regarding Outer Mongolia do not show any aggression against floviet Russia, 1957, document number. It is my understanding that the territory covered by the so-called "Peoples Republic of Outer Mongolia," was part of the territory under the sovereignty of China, and that China protested the stationing of Russian troops and the so-called alliance of aggression by Russia against China, and not by aggression of Japan against China; and that

1 2

the Peoples Republic was in no way recognized by China until the summer of 1945.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they do not touch admissibility. You are dealing really with final facts and not preliminary facts for the purpose of determining the question of evidence.

MR. FURNESS: My point is, sir, that they show no aggression against the Soviet Republic, which proof is now being offered; that the mere fact, even if it was a republic that Russia was in alliance with, does not make it aggression against Russia.

THE PRESIDENT: One of my colleagues points out that page 2 of the document shows <u>prima facie</u> its purpose against Russia.

Mr. OKAMOTO.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: I should like to ask the prosecution, that of the three documents just presented, exhibit 737 and 738 mention dates; that is, the year 1943. However, exhibit 739 bears no date both in the English and the Japanese text. I should like to have the prosecution give the exact date — clarify the date in the document just referred to.

THE PRESIDENT: We ask that dates be supplied in all cases if they are available.

The objection by Major Furness is overruled.

The document is admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
No. 1957 will receive exhibit No. 740.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 740 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1048, a recess was taken until 1103, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

ŀ

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 1 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. r THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov. S 3 COLONEL IVANOV: If the Tribunal please, I 4 shall read short excerpts from these documents. D The first document, No. 1962, exhibit No. 737, d 6 "Instructions pertaining to the Sabotage Activities 7 for Eduction and Training for the year of Showa (1943)." - 8 I quote page 1: 9 "June 16, 1943. Kwantung Army Intelligence 10 Department. 11 "The Sabotage Activities education and train-12 ing for the 18th year of Showa (1943) should be based 13 14 on this direction. "June 6, 1943. 15 "Chief of the Intelligence Department, 16 "Kwantung Army, DOI, Akio." 17 Paragraph 1 under the title of "General Rule," 18 19 reads as follows: 20 "I. General Rule. "This direction is based on the Kwantung Army 21 Headquarters Educational directions of this 18th year 22 of Showa (1943) for the special corps with consideration 23 of the results obtained from the previous trainings." 24 I quote document No. 1956, exhibit No. 738: 25

"The directions in relation to the guidance of the White Russians."

This document stamped "Top Secret" also pertains to the documents of the Second Conference of the Kwantung Army Intelligence Department. The following is said in paragraph 1 of this document. I quote the last paragraph on page 1:

"Whether they are men or women or whether they wish it or not, the White Russians shall be used powerfully and to the maximum degree for the war with the Soviet Union, especially for the secret war with the Soviet Union."

As far as document No. 1971, exhibit No. 739, is concerned, we shall additionally present to the Tribunal the certificate -- we shall present the certi-16 ficate establishing the date of this document which was in one file with all four documents which were presented 18 now concerning the Second Conference of the Kwantung Army Intelligence Department.

I quote prosecution document No. 1971, exhibit No. 739:

"Top Secret.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

20

21

22

"Plan for carrying out the training of White Russian Youths in the special immigration settlements, Kharbin Special Service Agency."

This document proves that the training of the whiteguard youth in special settlements, or ganized in Manchuria by the Japanese, was paid for out of the Japanese state budget. The following is said in chapter 8, "Funds Necessary for Training," page 4, paragraph 2:

"As a rule the funds for subsidizing special settlers and for training will be used to meet the expenses for personnel, equipment, training materials and other sundry expenses; the Commandant of the Harbin Special Luties Organization will be responsible for checking and apportioning the expenditures of these funds. Other measures in addition to this budget may be taken with the permission of the commandant when recognized as being especially necessary."

I quote document No. 1957, exhibit 740: "The Principles of the Japanese Propaganda Campaign against Outer Mongolia." I repeat the title: "The Principles of the Japanese Propaganda Campaign against Outer Mongolia."

I quote an extract from the second part of the document, page 1, last paragraph:

"Section II. Propaganda Measures Against
Outer Mongolia."

I quote item 1:

"The ultimate objective of propaganda in Outer Mongolia is positively to induce the Outer Mongolians to become anti-Soviet, that is, to cooperate with Japan, and in attaining this final objective the propaganda work shall go through something like the following steps:

"First stage: Frustration of public confidence in the present government.

"Second stage: Opposition of the military and the populace against the present government.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"Third stage: Estrangement from and resistance against the Soviet Union, that is, cooperation with Japan."

The following results of the propaganda are given for the third state. I quote:

- "1. Numerous riots and revolts.
- "2. Birth of an autonomous government under the leadership of the Japanese Army.
 - "3. War against Russia.

In the last vertical column, the following is pointed out as the final result. I quote: "Outbreak of a Russo-Japanese war at a certain time."

If the Tribunal please, we wish now to conduct direct examination of the witness KAWABE, Torashiro, and cross-examination.

Yes.

TORASHIRO KAWABE, called as a witness. on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY COLONEL IVANOV: 6 Mr. Witness, please give your full name. Q 8 KAWABE, Torashiro. 9 How old are you? Q 10 Fifty-six. 11 What position did you hold in 1932 during 12 your stay in the Soviet Union? 13 Military Attache, Japanese Embassy, in Soviet 14 Russia. 15 What position did you hold from April to 16 September, 1945, in the Japanese General Staff? 17 Assistant Chief of the General Staff. 18 What was your last rank in the Japanese Army? Q 19 Lieutenant General. A 20 Mr. Witness, I present to you prosecution 21 document No. 2661, which is an affidavit in the Japanese 22 language. Please consider this document and tell the 23 Tribunal whether you wrote and signed this affidavit 24 yourself.

Is everything written by you in this affidavit true and correct?

Yes.

COLONEL IVANOV: If the Tribunal please, I present in evidence prosecution document 2661, the affidavit of KAWABE, Torashiro.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2661 will receive exhibit No. 741.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 741, and was received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: Now I shall read the affidavit of KAWABE, Torashiro. I quote:

"I, Torashiro KAWABE (age 56) hereby state under oath as follows:

"1. I served as a military attache to the Japanese Embassy in Moscow from January 1932 to March 1934.

"2. I admit that the five sheets of documents which were shown to me represent photographic copies of the original of the report which was written in my own handwriting and sent to the General Staff Office at Tokyo from Moscow on 14th July, 1932. I affixed my signature on the back of each photographic copy which

21

22

23 24

I recognized.

"I admit that the date of dispatch of these documents coincides with the date of the photographic copy of the envelope.

"3. I admit that the other four photographic copies which were shown to me are the copies of the original of the record which Lieutenant-Colonel KASAHARA of the General Staff Office had Lieutenant-Colonel KANDA transmit to me in Moscow on 10th July, 1932. The first page of the said four is a copy of my own handwriting, but I think the other three are probably copies of the record written by YAMOKA who was my assistant.

"To certify the foregoing, I affixed my signature of my recognition on the back of the first sheet of the photographic copies of the documents.

"Torashiro KAWABE."
BY COLONEL IVANOV (Continued):

Q Mr. Witness, I present to you prosecution document No. 1991. This document has been submitted to the Tribunal and has been given exhibit No. 701. Please consider this document and tell the Tribunal what you make of it.

A I say that these documents contain opinions which I entertained at that time and which I reported

2

4 5

6

8

10

12 13

14

15

16

18

20

22

23

24

25

to the central army authorities in Tokyo.

Q Mr. Witness, please tell the Tribunal, is the original of this document written in your own hand, and did you, yourself, make inscriptions on the back of each page of the photo copy of this document?

A Yes, it is exactly as you have asked.

Q What inscriptions, Mr. Witness, did you make on the back of page 1 and 2 of the photo copy of this document?

A I acknowledge that these photo copies bear the handwriting of myself, KAWABE, Torashiro, dated September 3, 1946. Also, on another document I recognize this photo copy as my own handwriting, KAWABE, Torashiro, dated September 3, 1946.

RUSSIAN INTERPRETER: Correction. Colonel Ivanov is correcting himself.

Q Mr. Witness, I present to you prosecution document No. 1654. This document has been submitted to the Tribunal, and has been given exhibit No. 702. Please consider this document and tell the Tribunal what you make of it.

A This is a photographic copy of the notes of matters which were transmitted to me by Lieutenant Colonel KANDA when he was passing through Moscow at that time.

25

Q Mr. Witness, please tell the Tribunal, is that which is written on pages 1 and 2 by your assistant true and correct?

A It is the truth that my assistant made this record.

Q Mr. Witness, I present to you prosecution document No. 2660. This document is an affidavit in the Japanese language. Please tell the Tribunal whether you wrote and signed this affidavit yourself.

A All that you said is true.

Q Mr. Witness, is everything stated in your affidavit true?

A Yes, the truth.

COLONEL IVANOV: I present to the Tribunal prosecution document -- correction: I present in evidence prosecution document 2660, the affidavit of KAWABE, Torashiro.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2660 will receive exhibit No. 742.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 742 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: We present this document to prove that the Commander of the Japanese General Staff

permitted the destruction of all secret documents after the surrender of Japan in 1945.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to the characterization of this document by the prosecutor and suggest that it proves whatever it proves and that it be allowed to speak for itself.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think that the prosecutor infringed the fair bounds of comment or: description.

COLONEL IVANOV: If the Tribunal please, I shall read the contents of this affidavit.

"I, Torashiro KAWABE (56 years old), state, under oath, as follows:-

"1. I, Lieutenent-Ceneral Torashiro KAWABE, was the Deputy Chief of General Staff from April 1945 till October of the same year. At that time the Chief of General Staff was General Yoshijiro UMEZU.

"2. The decision concerning the surrender was made by His Majesty the Emperor on August 13,1945. On August 14, 1945, the decision concerning the surrender was communicated to the Allied Powers by radio. The formal signature of surrender was made by Japanese representatives on September 2, 1945.

"3. All of the secret and top-secret docu-

ments and records of the General Staff had been burned in Tokyo during the time from August 13, 1945 until the day we received from the Allied Powers the orders prohibiting the burning of documents.

"Among the documents burned were documents of mobilization plans, military operation plans, and the documents referring to the guidance of the war, as well as records of Supreme War Council.

"At that time the burning of secret and topsecret documents was done by persons whose ranks were lower than those of the chiefs of sections of the Army General Staff.

"When the documents were burned, General UMEZU, Chief of Army General Staff, was in Tokyo.

"I do not know whether or not any written or oral orders were issued concerning the destruction of all documents of the Army General Staff office.

"Furthermore, I do not know whether or not any documents of Japanese General Staff have been concealed.

(Signed) Torashiro KAWABE"

22 23 24

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

"Te have finished the direct interrogation now, and if the defense wishes to cross-examine the witness they may conduct their cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps the description of what the affidavit contains was somewhat exaggerated in the remarks of the prosecutor, having read the affidavit.

Dr. KIYOSE.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

BY DR. KIYOSE:

Q A little while ago, Mr. Witness, you confirmed the fact that exhibit 702 was a notation of knowledge which had been communicated to you by Lieutenant Colonel KANDA. From whom was the matter communicated?

A This was communicated to me from Major KASAHARA -- Lieutenant Colonel KASAHARA.

? Does this pertain to the fact that the decision was publicly made by the authorities in Tokyo or was it KASAHARA's personal view?

A I do not believe that they were the individual opinions, the personal opinions of KASAHARA.

But, I do not recollect -- I have no recollection whether or not he clearly stated that such a policy had been officially established in Tokyo.

and was the same

2

6

7 8

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

Q Was this plan later carried into effect?

I believe that it was carried into effect step by step.

- From when to when?
- I cannot state the dates clearly.
- Mr. Witness, you testified about sending a report from Moscow to Japan. Now, in the last analysis, does it mean to carry the plan into effect or to make preparation?

The opinion which I sent to central army authorities from Moscow contained -- I sent it with the hope that the central army authorities would act in accordance with such a policy.

I am asking you, Mr. Witness, whether the whole idea of yours was limited to preparation or not.

I am afraid that the questions that you are asking me are somewhat different from what I have been thinking about just now.

THE PRESIDENT: You must answer the questions if you can, no matter how little thought you may have given to them. But you may ask for time to consider.

(Continuing) The opinions which I sent from Moscow were largely a matter of principle, and I had no idea -- special idea of carrying it out immediately into effect. However, I should like to be shown the document if such a thing is possible, and I would like to answer -- give a true and correct answer regarding this point, if I may.

DR. KIYOSE: Mr. President, may that document be shown the witness?

THE PRESIDENT: If you so desire.

(Whereupon, a paper was handed to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: What is the number of the exhibit he is looking at?

CLERK OF THE COURT: 702.

THE WITNESS: This document is the wrong document. The number on it says prosecution No. 1654.

THE PRESIDENT: He is now looking at exhibit 701.

THE WITNESS: On re-reading the document,

I find that I sent this -- that this document was my
opinion on the line of policy to be adopted as a
whole, and I cannot definitely state to you whether
my opinion was concerned solely with the preparation
or with the preparation and the execution of such
plan against the Soviet Union.

•

18

20

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21 22

23

24

The main point is to be found in the latter part of this document, with respect to policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. In this part of the document he said that for the time being the . strength should be exercised with respect to Soviet 5 Russia and that Japan should not initiate or take any action which would lead to a conflict with that country. That is why I ask you, Mr. Witness, that here as well as in other passages your purport was that no plan should be carried into execution for 10 the time being and that it was the better part of 11 wisdom to exercise restraint and to prepare in the

more mental or spiritual sense.

Now I unserstand the purport of your question. As you have said, the purport of my opinion was that in case either the government or the army should carry out into execution plans against the Soviet Union, as a matter of principle, I asked that ... our side should do nothing to bring about a Soviet -war with the Soviet Union, and that we should not pursue any policy with such a view in end.

THE MONITOR: To pursue any policy such as would stimulate the Soviet Union.

DR. KIYOSE: That concludes my crossexamination. The cross-examination will be contin-

2 3

who was with a fell

6

12

13

14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

ued by the counsel for the accused UMEZU.

MR. MIYATA: I am MIYATA, counsel for the accused UMEZU. With the permission of the Tribunal, I should like to ask some questions on the basis of exhibit No. 742, prosecution document No. 2660.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. MIYATA:

In your affidavit you have stated that the decision to surrender was arrived at on the 13th of August, 1945 in accordance with his Majesty's decision and that, later, documents belonging to the General Staff office were burned. By whose orders were these various documents destroyed?

Concorning the burning of these documents, I, myself, as Vice Chief of the General Staff, received no direct orders from the Chief of the General Staff, General UMEZU.

May I continue? Also, neither did I order the burning of these documents to my subordinates.

Then may I take it that your reply means that the destroying of the documents was not carried out under the orders of the Chief of the General Staff nor under the orders of you, as Vice Chief of the General Staff?

It is as you say.

7

8

1

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19 20

21

23

24

In your affidavit you say that secret and other documents had been destroyed under orders of section chiefs or those of lesser rank. Now, did these men destroy these records by their own private decision, or did they have any legal grounds or legal authority to carry out such an action, or were they permitted to do so by departmental regulations? The truth of the matter is as follows. THE PRESIDENT: We will take the remainder of the answer after lunch. We will adjourn now until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

23 24

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

olf & Yelden

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Counsellor MIYATA.

BY MR. MIYATA (Continued):

Q "ill you reply to my last question? If you do not recall I shall repeat my question.

A Please repeat it.

documents was issued neither by the Chief of Staff nor by you as Vice Chief of Staff; however, in your affidavit you state that section chiefs and other officers under them had these documents burned. Now, if so, in such cases of erergency are there any departmental regulations or custom which would permit men of such rank of section chief or division chief to destroy these records? I should like you to explain the facts with respect to this question.

A According to peacetime -- according to normal business regulations of the General Staff office they should have waited for an order from me, the Deputy Chief of Staff, before ordering such documents burnt. That is, because under the regulations -- under the

administrative regulations of the General Staff office -- administrative matters were under my jurisdiction -- were under the jurisdiction of the Deputy Chief of Staff -- and therefore in normal times the Chief of Staff -- the Deputy Chief of Staff -- the Deputy Chief of Staff -- should give such orders. The reason why the section chief ordered the burning of those documents at that time, however, is that they believed that that time was the time to apply the field manual -- the regulations of the field manual -- which regulate actions to be taken on the field. That is because at that time --

IR. BROOKS: If the Court please, we are not getting this at all on our transmission. The last part, we did not get at all.

A (Continuing) That is because at that time the situation was most unfavorable and we could see that a grave crisis was approaching; that is to say, we even felt that American and Red Army parachute divisions might land on the General Staff office and occupy the Imperial Headquarters. It was in such a tense atmosphere that the burning of these documents was carried out. Therefore, because I was occupied with -- extremely busy with -- other matters at the time the section chiefs believed that it was not a

metter with which I should be bothered and because of the training which they had received in ordinary times that important documents must not be handed over to the enemy and because of their conviction in this respect, they carried out the burning of the documents arbitrarily. This is the situation at the time in the General Staff office and as for the situation in the regiments throughout Japan, instructions from the war l'inistry were sent out at almost the same time to destroy all documents. Later when an order came from the Allied Supreme Command prohibiting the burning the destruction of documents — this order was trans—mitted to all remaining army units. I conclude.

Q Then, Mr. "itness, may I interpret your statement in the following manner: that the burning of the documents was compelled by the critical situation or emergency existing at that time?

A Please do so.

One more, Mr. "itness: The destroying of the documents did not start on the 13th of August but step by step as the military situation became unfavorable and critical. May I take your statement -- that is the way I understand.

THE MONITOR: A slight addition: When the military situation became unfavorable on the 7th and

4

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

8th they began to burn the documents and gradually it reached up to the point where you stopped; is that right?

I am sorry, I can give you no definite reply concerning the date on which the burning began. understand that it was around the time when the Emperor made his decision but I can give you no definite reply.

Just one more, Mr. "itness: In your affidavit you state that at the time the documents were destroyed General UMEZU, thief of the General Staff, was in Tokyo. At such a critical time can you tell me something about UMEZU's movements? "hat kind of movements, please?

At the time, although my room was next to the room of the Chief of Staff, there were days on which I was unable to see him at all for the entire day. That gives you an idea of how busy he was attending conferences either at the Palace or of the Supreme Council for the direction of the war.

> MR. MIYATA: This concludes my cross-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

> > CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY IR. FURNESS:

General KAWABE, you have testified that in 1932 you were military attache of Japan at Moscow. As such you were under the General Staff, were you not?

I was under the direct control of the General Α 1 Staff office. 2 I show you exhibit 702 and ask you to inspect 3 the first page of that exhibit. I think you have testified that that writing on that first page was in your own handwriting; is that correct? The first page is in my handwriting. 7 C What does it say? 8 "Message from KANDA - (July 25) -- On August 9 15 there was a communication"--10 11 I think you must have the wrong page. Are 12 you sure that is the first page? 13 THE INTERPRETER: The witness also said that 14 the rest of the page is illegible. 15 Ü It may be the cover. Yes, that's right. 17 I want you to look at the original of the 18 cover and tell us what it says. 19 The first page of the original? A 20 0 Yes. 21 I did not write the first page of the original. 22 I take back my former -- what I said before. I wrote 23 only the cover of the original.

24

That does the cover say?

A "A message of Lieutenant Colonel KANDA (July

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

15) -- On August 16 KAWABE out of necessity" -- After that the rest is illegible. The original had more writing on it, did it not -- the original of which that is a photostatic copy? I have no clear recollection but gathering from the general purport of the whole, I believe that there was nothing else besides that. O Does it not appear from that photostatic copy that parts of the original were covered when the photostatic copy was made -- when the photograph was made? I am sorry. I am unable to gather anything A from this document. Do you know what year the August 16 refers to? A I believe it was the 7th year of Showa, 1932. You do not know what the writing means, do you? Q I do. 4. MR. FURNESS: That is all. There will be no further cross-examination by the defense. MR. GOLUNSKY: There will be no redirect. THE PRESIDENT: No re-examination. Colonel Ivanov.

The witness is released on the usual terms.

Accession of the Contract of t

:

5

8

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I thought the witness said, "No." He said, apparently, "Yes, I know," and I thought he said, "No."

THE PRESIDENT: I understood him to say, "Yes, I know," and I was wondering why a further question was not put but it was not for me.

MR. FURNESS: I would be glad to have him recalled, sir.

("hereupon, the witness resumed the stand.)

THE PRESIDENT: Take your seat. You are still on oath.

BY MR. FURNESS (Continued):

? You have testified that you know what the writing means. What did it mean? I am referring now to the cover from which you just read, stating that parts of it you could not read. If you would like to see it again I will have the Clerk hand it to you.

"hat does that writing on the cover mean?

A It is a message from Lieutenant Colonel KANDA dated the 15th of July. After that some words follow but it is difficult for me to understand what they mean. I have been trying to think what they mean but I have no recollection and it is difficult for me to make any suppositions at this late date.

.

20

21

22

23

KA"ABE

MR. FURNESS: That is all the cross-examination of this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: He has not thrown any light on it.

IR. FURNESS: We request that the prosecution furnish us with the original of which this is a photostatic copy.

THE PRESIDENT: Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: We have no original at our disposal. We have only the photostatic copy.

THE PRESIDENT: I take it you mean the original is not in Japan. If we require its production, we will say so.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, the document was procured by the Intelligence Service and I am afraid that in Russia we also have nothing but a photostatic copy.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know just what it means, Minister Golunsky, but if the prosecution in any case use a document they cannot claim security for its nonproduction. However, if my colleagues require the document, I shall say so. For the time being they are not asking for it.

My colleagues draw my attention to the certificate attached to this particular photostatic

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. GOLUNSKY: If I understand correctly, this inscription means that the original photograph is in the archives, but if the Tribunal does want a

is in the archives of the Department of the Red Army,

In the certificate it says that the original

NO PROPERTY.

more definite certificate I can try to get one.

THE PRESIDENT: For the time being the

Tribunal is satisfied to point out the facts as stated in the prosecution's document.

Colonel Ivanov.

Chief Military Prosecution, Moscow.

COLONEL IVANOV: There is no redirect examination. The witness may be lead out of the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is released on the usual terms.

("hereupon, the witness was excused.)

COLONEL IVANOV: We shall present to the Tribunal the affidavits of the persons who know well, the activities of the Japanese military mission in Manchuria and actually participated in them.

If the Tribunal please, I shall quote excerpts from prosecution document No. 2364, exhibit No. 730, which has earlier been submitted to the Tribunal. The affidavit of K. V. Rodzaevsky, former head of the Thite Guard organization in Manchuria,

the Russian Fascist Union.

COLONEL IVANOV: I quote from his affidavit

of the state of th

"A. The Japanese had great faith in the whiteguards, who lived in Manchuria, in connection with the preparation for an attack against the U.S.S.R. and therefore tried to activize the anti-Soviet activities of the whiteguards. It was planned that during the war against the Soviet Union the whiteguards would be used as armed force, and after the end of the war successful for Japan, they were to carry out Japanese policy in the areas annexed from the U.S.S.R. The direction of the Anti-Soviet activities of the whiteguards organizations was carried out by the Japanese military missions, which in their turn were directed by the chief Japanese military mission in Kharbin.

"Besides the whiteguard organizations were supported from Japan itself.

"General ARAKI and General KOISO personally promised me to render any help in activizing the anti-Soviet work of the 'Russian Fascist Union.'

"The 'R.F.S.' was also supported by the Jananese organization 'The Black Dragon' headed by Mitsuru TOOYAMA."

I omit several paragraphs and quote further:
Doge 10:

"You can judge of the role for which the

Japanese prepared the whiteguards by the statements

made by the chief of the Kharbin Military mission,

General DOI, in the talk which took place in December

1943 in the train going from Kharbin to the Sungari 2

station, to which went in connection with the so-called

Sungari Russian Military detachment being formed there,

told me that 'Bureau of the Russian Emigrant's Affairs'

created by the Japanese must consider itself to be a

future Russian Government.

"In several talks which I had in 1934 with
Major AKIKUSA, assistant chief of the Japanese Military mission, he told me that Japan was preparing for
a war against the U.S.S.R. and in connection with this
recommended to me to consolidate contact with SEMENOV,
a whiteguard ataman, whom the Japanese considered
chief of whiteguard emigrants, and whom they proposed
as a leader of future 'National Government of Russia.'"

I again omit several paragraphs and continue to duote page 10, paragraph 6:

"In 1934 the Japanese military mission in Kharbin decided to unite all whiteguard organizations for the purpose of establishing centralized guidance of their activities against the U.S.S.R. In the same wear the Bureau of Russian Emigrants Affairs in the Manchuria Empire was created as a united body of all those organizations. It was subordinated to the Japanese Military Mission in Charbin.

"Through The Bureau of Russian Emigrants in Kharbin and its branches in other towns in Manchuria, the Japanese Military missions recruited whiteguards for the purpose of sabotage activities on the territories of the Soviet Union.

"A special detechment was recruited in 1936 from the members of the Russian Fascist Union' according to the proposal made by SUZUKI, a Japanese intelligence officer of the Kharbin Mission. This Detachment was placed under the command of MATVEY PLATONOVICH MASLAKOV, a whiteguard, my side.

"This detechment armed and equipped by the Japanese was in the Autumn of the same year smuggled across the Amur River onto the Soviet Union Territory for the purpose of terrorist and sabotage activities

and also for the establishment of fascist underground organizations. The smagling was carried out by SUZUKI and by ENOZUKA, a member of the Japanese military mission in Kharbin.

4 5

3

"In the same year, i.e. 1936, and in the following years many other agents trained in the Japanese Military Mission were smuggled into the Soviet Union.

7

6

oniton.

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

"In 1937 the so-called secret schools were organized at the 'Russian Fascist Union' and 'Mon-erchist Union' in accordance with the order of Major ONOUCHI, chief of the 3rd Department of the Japanese Military mission in Kharbin. These schools trained future organizers of sabotage activities in the U.S.S.R. rear.

"I was appointed director of the school at the 'Russian Fascist Union'. SUZUKI was my assistent. Those who graduated from the schools were sent to work in the Japanese Military Missions.

"In 1938 instead of secret schools the
Kharbin Military Mission established a special school
at the mission training agents for reconnaissance
work directed against the U.S.S.R. In this school
were trained the organizers of anti-Soviet propaganda
who later on would work in Japanese missions in the
frontier area."

3

6

7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

17

18

19

21 22

23

25

I again omit several paragraphs and resume reading from page 12, paragraph 7.

"In 1938, the Kharbin Military mission established at the Sungari Station 2 a secret 'Russian Detachment Asano' in which the white guard youth were trained for a war against the USSR.

"This detachment was considered by the Japanese as a model of all anti-Soviet formations.

"General HATA, chief of the Japanese Military Mission in Kharbin while inspecting this detachment said to its members that they formed the backbone of the future Russian Army.

"I, personally, several times visited the 'ASANO DETACHMENT' to give anti-Soviet lectures. In 1939, several men of the detachment participated in the Japanese provocation in the Nomangan area.

"In 1943 the 'Asano detachment' was enlarged and transformed int 'Russian detachments of the Manchurian Army'. In view of this three detachments were formed; cavalry detachment at the Sungari station, infantry detachment at the Handaohedzy station and a cossack detachment at the town of Hailar."

COLONEL IVANOV (Continuing): If the Tribunal please, I shall draw their attention to the fact that SUZUKI, who is mentioned in the affidavit of Rodzaevsky, is not the same SUZUKI who is sitting in the dock here.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: If the Court pleases, I would like to say we find it very difficult and very confusing in trying to keep up with all these documents here, and particularly when they are referred back to and given identification numbers and exhibit numbers; and so I hope that the Tribunal will bear with me insofar that I had a little difficult time in locating this document.

I understand that the prosecution just referred to exhibit No. 730. I also call your Honor's attention to the fact that on page 3 of the English translation in the third paragraph therein which has been quoted by the prosecutor there is a half-sentence. I am sorry. It is the fourth paragraph. I know, of course, your Honor's ruling on excerpts, and I am also aware of the fact that your Honor ruled that the complete sentence must be given if any excerpts are going to be admissible. I object to the reading of these documents of half-sentences, and I ask your Honor,

5 6

1.2

even if the whole sentence is permitted, why, I would like to find out whether or not in the second paragraph on page 3 and also in the fourth paragraph on page 3 insofar as the witnesses are not here, whether or not the publication is going to be produced by the prosecution or the album which has not been read and referred to is going to be produced by the prosecution; and, if not, I would like to request that it be granted to me.

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. GOLUNSKY: The objection of the learned counsel is somewhat premature. This part of the affidavit has not yet been read, and when I verified during the recess what Colonel Ivanov intended to read, I instructed him to read this whole part of the affidavit; so, if the learned counsel would have waited for ten minutes, he would have saved the time for the objection.

MR. McMANUS: If your Honor pleases, I know the afficavit is in evidence, and it has been referred to on many occasions, and I do not understand Russian, with all due respect to the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: The case appears to be presented 23 with logical sequence, to say the least, and I think that accounts for the order in which the exhibits have been tendered.

Coming to the second objection, the particular sentence is not a simple sentence, but a compound sentence, and the second part may well be left out. If included, it does not seem to help the defense; on the contrary, it is against them.

COLONEL IVANOV: I skip one paragraph and continue reading, page 3:

"During my second visit to Tokyo in March,
1939 for the purpose of establishing connection with
the representatives of governmental circles of Japan
as regards 'The Russian Fascist Union', I again met
ARAKI who at that time was Minister of Education.

"Being at my request received by him in the premises of the Ministry of Education I informed ARAKI in brief about the work of the 'Russian Fascist Union' and told him about the prospects of this work.

"ARAKI promised to help us as before, and wrote in my album his autograph: 'An eternal friend of Russia, but not of the Soviets' as a token of his intention to fight to the end for the creation of 'National Russia' where Japan would have unlimited influence.

"General KOISO, the Japanese Minister of Colonies, who from 1933 to 1235 was Chief of the Kwantung Army Headquarters also told me about the

aggressive plans of Japan concerning the USSR. I met KOISO twice during my visits to Tokyo.

"When I first met him in the Ministry of Colonies in Merch, 1939 KOISO promised me his support of the anti-Soviet activities of the 'Russian Fascist Union'.

"I met him for the second time in October
1939 when I came to Tokyo on an excursion organized
by the Kharbin Military Mission. KOISO received me
in his flat and in our conversation concerning the
relations of Japan with the USSR said that Japan
strove to drive Soviet Russia from the Pacific Ocean."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: May I inquire again from you,
Mr. President, whether or not the prosecutor intends
to produce this publication and also the album; and,
if not, may I request a direction from the Court that
I might possibly be permitted to see them. I make
this request, if the Court pleases, in view of the
fact that the witness will not be here.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, the publications referred to in the affidavit of Rodzaevsky were published in Northern Manchuria. As to the personal album of Rodzaevsky in which ARAKI made the

inscription, we don't have it at our disposal. We can inquire in Moscow whether it is at the disposal of the Soviet authorities.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I would like to call to their attention, I think this is in exhibit 102 of the biographies of General KOISO as placed by the prosecution, that on July 15, 1938 the General was attached to the Military General Staff Department, that on July 29, 1938 the General was placed on the reserve list and his active military power terminated as of that date. It will be noted on page 3, the last paragraph refers to General KOISO as the Japanese Minister of Colonies in March, 1939. It will be noted that on the document already placed into evidence by the prosecution that on April 7, 1939 KOISO was appointed to the Ministry of Overseas Affairs Department under HIRANUMA, and that he was relieved of this post on August 30, 1939 on his own request.

Now if the Court will direct its attention to the top of page 4, exhibit 730, it states that he was met again in October, 1939. I would like to point out to the Court that, on the prosecution's own record, he was not holding any official job in the military or with the government in a position of official capacity

at either time of this alleged meeting, that I will, in fact, put evidence forth that meetings never took place as alleged.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, your observations about KOISO's position are noted, Captain Brooks.

Until the Tribunal directs otherwise, the publications referred to by Mr. McManus, I should say the newspaper and the album are not required by the Tribunal.

COLONEL IVANOV: If the Tribunal please, I shall draw their attention to the fact that HATA who is mentioned in Rodzaevsky's affidavit is not the same HATA who is in the dock here.

The role played by the Japanese Military circles in recruiting the elements hostile toward the Soviet Union from the white-guard emigrants and in organizing them for the sabotage activities against the U.S.S.R. is confirmed by a number of Japanese military men, who were interrogated as witnesses.

I shall quote extracts from prosecution document No. 2238, exhibit No. 723, which has earlier been presented to the Tribunal, the affidavit of YANAGITA, Genzo, Lieutenant-General, former Chief of the Kharbin Military Mission.

YANAGITA stated: I quote page 6, last paragraph:

3

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

17

16

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

"Q. Did you have anything to do with the White Russians while you were the Commander of the Army Special Service Agency at Harbin?

"A. Yes. By orders from the commander of the Kwantung Army, we had to train "hite Russians as instigators, propagandists, scouts, and saboteurs. White Russian forces were disguised as forces in the Manchurian Army.

"Some of the White Russians worked in the Army Special Service Agency, performing propaganda and scouting functions."

I quote further page 7.

"Q. Was there any school for the training of White Russians as scouts, saboteurs and propagandists at the time you were the Commander of the Army Special Service Agency at Harbin?

"A. As I have already stated, by command of General UMEZU, Commander of the Kwantung Army, the Army Special Service Agency was responsible for preparing and training White Russians as future propagandists and scouts."

YANAGITA in his affidavit gave detailed information on the so-called ASANO detachments. I quote page 8:

"Q. What is the ASANO Unit?

Committee of the second

"A. It is a unit composed of White Russians for sabotage activity.

"Q. Tell me by whom it was organized.

"A. It was organized by the Kwantung Army Headquarters about 1936 (Showa 11). Lieutenant-Colonel YAMAOKA, as Assistant to the Chief of the Second Section took charge of it.

"Q. Was the ASANO Unit still in existence at the time you were the Commander of the Army Special Service Agency?

"A. Yes, it was.

"Q. Did the Kwantung Army Headquarters know of its existence?

"A. Of course. In general, we did nothing without the directions of the Commander of the Kwantung Army. By his command the ASANO Unit was included in Manchoukuo Army. The members were the uniforms of the Manchoukuo Army.

"Q. How many soldiers were there in the ASANO Unit?

"A. It was composed of five companies. Most of them were posted in the neighborhood of the Second Sungari Station and the rest in Hengtaohotzu and Hailar. The unit had about 700 soldiers in general.

"Q. What was the duty of the ASANO Unit?

The duty of the ASANO Unit was to train ~ 2 sabotage units in case of a war against Soviet Union. 3 The commander was Colonel ASANO (a Japanese) of the 4 Manchoukuo Army. "Q. What agencies paid money to it? "A. The Manchoukuo War Ministry paid money 7 until 1941, but it was paid by the Kwantung Army Head-8 quarters since the special plan of the Kwantung Army 9 manoeuvre (*KANTOKUEN*) was drawn up. "Q. Did the Army Special Service Agency 11 store military uniforms of the Soviet Russian Army 12 for the ASANO Unit? "A. Yes, the Special Service Agency had a 13 14 number of complete sets of the uniform of the Red 15 Army soldiers (military uniform) prepared for the 16 ASANO Unit in case of war. "Q. For what purpose was the military uni-17 18 form of Soviet Russian soldiers stored? "A. To have the saboteurs of the ASANO Unit 19 20 put them on in order to deceive the Red Army." I present to the Tribunal in evidence Pros-21 ecution document No. 1983, the affidavit of AKIKUSA, 23 Shun, Chief of the Kwantung Army Information Department. 24 The document is offered to prove that Japan widely used the whiteguards for activities hostile towards the U.S.S.R. I would like to respectfully call the Tribunal's attention to the fact that there is a wrong date, February 22, 1945, on the first page. It is an accidental mistake, and as the attached certificates show the interrogation took place on February 22, 1946.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 1983 will receive exhibit No. 743.

("hereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 743 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: Speaking on the utilization of the whiteguards, AKIKUSA, Shun stated: I quote his answer on page 9.

"A. The Japanese side used the White Russian emigrants as spies, propagandists and saboteurs, and in order to create disturbance in the Soviet Union territory, Japan organized three detachments of the White Russian emigrants at the Second Sungari Station, Hailar and Hengtaohotsu."

THE PRESIDENT: That is on page 10 of the English copy.

COLONEL IVANOV: I omit answers on other questions and quote further:

" | city alone must mave a

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would like to respectfully call the Tribunal's attention to the fact that there is a wrong date, February 22, 1945, on the first page. It is an accidental mistake, and as the attached certificates show the interrogation took place on February 22, 1946.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1983 will receive exhibit No. 743.

("hereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 743 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: Speaking on the utilization of the whiteguards, AKIKUSA, Shun stated: I quote his answer on page 9.

"A. The Japanese side used the White Russian emigrants as spies, propagandists and saboteurs, and in order to create disturbance in the Soviet Union territory, Japan organized three detachments of the White Russian emigrants at the Second Sungari Station, Hailar and Hengtachotsu."

THE PRESIDENT: That is on page 10 of the English copy.

COLONEL IVANOV: I omit answers on other questions and quote further:

"Q. How were you connected with Russian
emigrants while you were an assistant of the Harbin
Special Service Agency?

"A. I participated in establishing 'the
Russian Emigrants Bureau' in Manchoukuo."

I omit two paragraphs and quote further:

"Q. What was the purpose of 'the Brem' (the Russian Emigrants Bureau) in itself?

"A. It consisted in bringing together White Russian Emigrants around Japan for the vurpose of widely enforcing anti-Soviet movement."

Now I quote page 2, paragraph 3.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: Correction: "Page 12,
paragraph 3."

COLONEL IVANOV (Reading):

"Q. What kind of assistance was given to the Brem' in Harbin by Japan?

"A. While I was an assistant of the Harbin Special Mission from 1933 to 1936, 'the Brem' did not receive any financial aid from Japan because it had its own funds, but from about 1937 it began to receive financial aid from the Japanese budget. When 'the Brem' was transferred to the Manchoukuo Government in 1944, the monthly sum of financial aid from Japan in Harbin city alone must have been more than ten thousand yen."

À

11

9

10

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

60

10

My colleague, Major-General Tadevosyan will continue presentation of evidence on the aggressive activities of the Japanese ruling clique and military circles directed against the U.S.S.R.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, the defense would like to have this witness whose document was just read, exhibit 743, called for cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Whereabouts is he, Minister Golunsky?

COLONEL ROSENBLIT: He is in Moscow now.

MR. LOGAN: May we have his status, if your Honor please, whether he is a prisoner of war, whether he is under trial, or whether his trial has been completed and judgment rendered against him?

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, in order to give the Tribunal absolutely accurate information, I have sent by telegraph an inquiry about all the Japanese witnesses referred to in our case as to their status at the present time, and as soon as I will get this information, I will submit it to the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court will consider Mr. Logan's application.

We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1444, a recess was

4 5

Morse & Bart

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now resumed.

THE MONITOR: Before we proceed, the Language Section wishes to make a correction. In the Russian prosecutor's words. He said that the HATA mentioned in the document was not the defendant HATA but it was another HATA. The other HATA should read HATA, Hikosaburo.

THE PRESIDENT: General Tadevosyan.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: Mr. President, Members of the Court:

Tribunal of the violations of the borders of the U.S. S.R. by the Japanese-Manchur an authorities, and of the undeclared wars against the U.S.S.R. which were waged by Japan in 1938 and 1939. But before that I shall present evidence that in 1931 and 1932, the Japanese government twice rejected the official proposals of the U.S.S.R. government to conclude a non-aggression pact, and continued her hostile policy towards the U.S.S.R.

I offer in evidence to the Military Tribunal an extract from the record of the talk between Litvinov, People's Commisar of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. and the Japanese Foreign Minister YOSHIZAWA which took

place on December 31, 1931, prosecution document No. 2369.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I object to any evidence of a refusal to sign a non-aggression pact on the ground that it doesn't prove any aggressive warfare or any plan of aggression. We object further on the ground that if history shows anything is does not show that the entry into a non-aggression pact prevents aggressive wars from breaking out.

I don't want it argued, but it is only my personal opinion, of course. Failure to agree to make a non-aggression pact taken alone would, of course, not be evidence of an intention to make war, but, taken in conjunction with other circumstances it may reveal a state of mind in favor of war. I cannot say that it isn't relevant to any issue, to the issue of aggressive war or preparation or conspiracy to wege it.

As to the second ground, that is to say the lessons to be drawn from history, that is a question of fact, of course, and has no bearing on the question of admissibility. The objections are overruled.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I present in evidence prosecution document 2369.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

:7

1 2

No. 2369 will receive exhibit No. 744.

(Whereupon, the document above referred

to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 744 and received in evidence.)

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

evident that an offer to conclude a non-aggression pact with the U.S.S.R. was made to YOSHIZAWA, who had just been appointed Foreign Minister, and who was in Moscow en route from Paris to Tokyo. This offer was made in the presence of HIROTA, the Japanese Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. This is what Litvinov said to YOSHIZAWA. I quote from the middle of the fourth paragraph of page 1:

"We are conducting negotiations with Poland, are starting negotiations with Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Roumania with the aim of conluding pacts of non-aggression and neutrality. We have concluded such pacts with Germany, Lithuania, Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan. The pact with France has been initialled. When these negotiations are completed and the pacts signed, we shall be bound by the pacts of non-aggression with all our neighbors with the exception of Japan.

"We consider that this gap should be filled, otherwise there will be a queer situation that Japan

will be our only neighbor who has no pact of nonaggression with us. Such a pact expresses the peaceful
policy and intentions of the Governments, and it will
be well-timed especially now when the future of the
Japanese-Russian relations is the subject of speculations in Western Europe and America. The conclusion
of this pact would put an end to these speculations.
I, therefore, decided to make use of the opportunity of
forwarding through YOSHIZAWA a proposal, to the
Japanese Government to open negotiations concerning
the conclusion of the non-aggression pact.

"This proposal took YOSHZ AWA, just as well as HIROTA who attended the talk, obviously by surprise. Having inquired in detail about the progress of negotiations with other countries mentioned by me in the course of our talk, YOSHIZAWA again repeated that he had been suddenly called from Paris to Tokyo and had, therefore, no time to make the policy of the new cabinet clear to himself, but that he certainly would not forget to forward our proposal to the Government."

Only on Pecember 13, 1932, that is, a year later, Foreign Minister UCHIDA handed over a verbal note to the Soviet Ambassador Troyanovsky. I offer in evidence the test of UCHIDA's note of December 13, 1932, prosecution document No. 2371.

-

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: We object to the introduction of these excerpts from what is termed "M. M. Litvinov's Diary." It is apparently not a real diary but what I think is called an aide memoire of a conference between the then foreign and an offical from Japan, YOSHISAWA, who was then Foreign Minister from Japan. Regardless of what it is, it appears to be an excerpt from a diplomatic publication and all we have here is a typewritten copy which does not show its official status at all. Furthermore, no motion has been made to exempt it from rule 6b(1) and we would like to have for inspection a copy of the entire document, publication

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, I think we should have explained that the document which was usued by Major General Tadevosyan is not a regular diary. It is the usual form in the Soviet Foreign Office that the minutes of talks between officials of the Foreign Office and representatives of foreign governments are written up in the form of a diary and bear at the head, usually, the inscription, "From the diary of such and such." If the Tribunal requires, we can easily produce evidence to prove what I just said. Therefore, this document is not an excerpt from some other bigger document but a complete record of a

25

1

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: We object to the introduction of these excerpts from what is termed "M. M. Litvinov's Diary." It is apparently not a real diary but what I think is called an aide memoire of a conference between the then foreign and an offical from Japan, YOSHISAWA, who was then Foreign Minister from Japan. Regardless of what it is, it appears to be an excerpt from a diplomatic publication and all we have here is a typewritten copy which does not show its official status at all. Furthermore, no motion has been made to exempt it from rule 6b(1) and we would like to have for inspection a copy of the entire document, publication

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, I think we should have explained that the document which was usued by Major General Tadevosyan is not a regular diary. It is the usual form in the Soviet Foreign Office that the minutes of talks between officials of the Foreign Office and representatives of foreign governments are written up in the form of a diary and bear at the head, usually, the inscription, "From the diary of such and such." If the Tribunal requires, we can easily produce evidence to prove what I just said. Therefore, this document is not an excerpt from some other bigger document but a complete record of a

as those which were produced here in Mr. Tavenner's phase of the case. It is the same type of document as, for instance, the record of the talk between OSHIMA and Ribbentrop and others which have been produced here. Therefore, the rule 6b(1) has nothing to do with the document. I should like to know if the Tribunal wants us to produce a vidence to prove the form of recording which I have just explained to the Tribunal. I understand that the title of the document, as it has been distributed, is misleading and it is our fault that we didn't explain it carlier.

THE PRESIDENT: I see no reference to
Litvinov in this document. Is he identified with
Troyanovsky?

MR. GOLUNSKY: The reference to Litvinov is at the head of page 1 of the document, 2369. The objection of the defense is not to document 2371 which Major General Tadevosyan was going to produce, but to the previous document.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, to the previous document.
MR. GOLUNSKY: 2369.

THE PRESIDENT: I had no idea they were referring to a document already admitted and read and apparently dealt with. Well, if the Members of the

Tribunal, after consideration, require any further document, well, they will say so.

Major Blakeney.

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I wish to mention a different matter, your Honor. In connection, however, with this same document.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, do take all your objections together. We expect that. We can never have objection after objection throughout the trial when all the objections can be most effectivly and expeditiously dealt with at once. It means a number of addresses or arguments instead of one.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: I don't propse to object; I wish to ask the direction of the Tribunal to a certain matter in connection with this document. Mr. Golunsky says it isn't a diary, but I suppose that we will have to consider it to be what it is labeled, which is diary. A diary is, of course, admissible by the specific provisions of the Charter, but in any event it would hardly stand on higher ground than an affidavit or deposition. We, therefore, wish to request in the case of this diary that the Court direct or that the Court consider our request for a direction, as it has done ' 24 in the case of affidavits, that this witness be called for cross-examination.

1 2

THE PRESIDENT: The Court will consider the application.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I repeat, I present in evidence prosecution document No. 2371, the text of UCHIDA's note handed over to the Soviet Ambassador Troyanovsky.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2371 will receive exhibit No. 745.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 745 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: In this note the Soviet proposal to conclude the pact was declined on the following grounds, I quote from the middle of the first paragraph on page 1:

"Some people are of the opinion that in view of the fact of the existence of different problems of such nature as may lead to differences between the two nations, it would be preferable to clear up the atmosphere and to provide for the settlement of these questions by means of a preliminary conclusion of such a non-aggression agreement. On the other hand, the opposite opinion is adhered to by those who believe that first of all efforts should be made to remove the cause

of such differences prior to the consideration of problems of a more general nature such as the conclusion of a non-aggression agreement.

"To sum up, the formal beginning of the negotiations on the subject between the two governments in this case seems to be untimely."

I further tender in evidence the text of the note delivered by the Soviet Government on January 4, 1933, to the Japanese Government, document No. 2372. That note made it rather clear to the Japanese Government, the true meaning of the motives for turning down the Soviet proposal mentioned in the Japanese note.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosectuion document
No. 2372 will receive exhibit No. 746.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 746 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, we are trying to object to these things in time but they go by so rapidly it seems we are a little late.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I paused and looked at the lectern and there is nobody there and nobody approaching it. "e are not too late.

*

MR. BLAKENEY: Shall I state the objection, sir?
THE PRESIDENT: You may.

MR. BLAKENEY: It is that the original exhibit of this document, 2372, in common with a number of the other exhibits of this same sort, ir marked "copy of a copy" or something of that nature. We have here nothing remotely resembling an original document, so far as we are able to determine, anywhere in the courtroom.

original was handed to the Japanese Government at the time and a copy sent to Moscow where it is now in the State Archives of the U.S.S.R. From this copy, a copy was made and certified by the Director of the Central Archives of the U.S.S.R., Professor Maksakov. Therefore, we contend that under the Charter, Article 13, the document is admissible.

MR. BLAKENEY: The cortificate indicates and the copy states that the original may be found in the Central Historical Records Office, U.S.S.R.

MR. GOLUNSKY: From the very sense of the note, it is easy to ascertain that the original was handed at the time to the Japanese Government and what is ment by "original" in the certificate is the original copy which was sent at the time by the Soviet Ambassador in Tokyo, Troyanovsky, to Moscow.

Duda & Barton

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is easy to accept your explanation, seeing that the original was a communication to the Japanese Government. All that you would have would be a copy of the original.

The question my colleagues have to decide, my colleagues and myself have to decide, is whether we will insist on the copy now in Moscow being produced or a photostat copy of it, or whether we will be satisfied with what we have. There may be many such attempts to prove very important documents in this way, so I will take the views of my colleagues.

Has any attempt been made to get the original in the Japanese Foreign Office?

MR. GOLUNSKY: I admit that we did not anticipate any difficulties in producing this cocument and we did not make this attempt. If the Tribunal so directs we will make it immediately.

THE PRESIDENT: A majority of the Tribunal has decided to admit the cony tendered here. It is already marked exhibit 746. The objection is overruled.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: If the Tribunal please,
I shall quote only one excerpt from this document. I
quote from the top of page 3:

"The substance of non-aggression pacts, as well as the substance of the Kellogy-Briand Pact lies

3)

in the principle that the states involved, taking into consideration the existence of controversies between them at present, or the possibility of new controversies in the future, refuse to settle them by the use of force. The Soviet Government on its part in no way considers that between the Union of Soviet Socialist Perublics and Japan there are controversies which cannot be settled, or which the Soviet Government refuses to settle by peaceful means. The negation of this would be contradictory to the Kellogg-Braind Pact, to which both the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Japan are signatories. Proposing a non-aggression pact with Japan, the Soviet Government has in no way ignored that international instrument, but meant to consolidate it by means of bilateral agreement to amplify it and to adapt it to the peculiarities of the relations between both nations. The proposal of the Soviet Government was not called forth by the considerations of the mement, but resulted from all its peaceful policy, and therefore continues in force for the future."

However, that did not help either. A new elaborately worded answer of the Japanese Government followed. I offer in evidence the text of the note

25

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of the Japanese Government of February 13, 1933, which note again turned down the proposal of the U.S.S.R. and in addition, expressed the discontent of the Japanese Government on account of the U.S.S.R. government's having published its note, Prosecution document No. 2373,

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I would like to point out to the Tribunal in objecting to the reception of this document that not only is it also a copy from a copy of the translation, but it is a document delivered by the Japanese representatives to the Soviet authorities, the original of which should therefore.be, as it is certified to be, in Moscow.

THE PRESIDENT: We have admitted copies in these circumstances, always reserving the right to call for the original if we think fit.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: If the Tribunal please, I shall not quote this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, if I understand your past rulings, you have followed Article 13c(5), and that is that the copies of documents have been admitted only if the original was not immediately available. And it is my recollection in all instances the Court, Tribunal, has requested that the original be made available before considering the copy, although some of them have been admitted conditionally.

THE PRESIDENT: If, as the certificate says, the original is in Moscow, it certainly is not immediately

4 5

available.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, what I am trying to point out is the difference in your present ruling and what you have made in the past. In the past you have asked that the original be produced; and now, as I understood your ruling on this last document, it was that if the Tribunal desired it.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, as I am reminded, my decision this afternoon is quite in conformity with what we have done previously. I do not see how I can do any more than that. If you will tell us that you have reason to think that these documents of which we are accepting copies do not exist or are not correctly represented in the copies, then we will take steps to direct the original to be produced. But you must give us grounds for thinking that the originals do not exist or are wrongly misstated in the copies.

MR. LOGAN: Of course, we do not take that position, your Honor, or we cannot take it. What we are contending is that the prosecution should produce the best evidence available to it, and the best evidence is the originals when they have possession of them.

As I say, I think your ruling in the past has been that the original be produced if it is available at all, whereas I think there is a distinction, with

all respect to the Tribunal, in the decision made this afternoon. That is, you have reserved unto yourselves the right to decide whether or not the original should be produced; and we think they should, for two reasons: one, in conformity with the Charter; and, two, in conformity with your previous decisions.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the Tribunal must be consistent in its decisions, of course. But our recollections appear to differ in this regard, Mr. Logan. If I find I am wrong, I will correct my decision, or the Tribunal's decision. But I feel sure we are right. I am supported by one of my colleagues, who listens very carefully and who has a good memory.

You will proceed with the reading of this document.

It is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2373 will receive exhibit No. 747.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 747, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: If the Tribunal please,
I shall not quote this document because it is once
more stated in the note that the Japanese Government
would not carry on negotiations on concluding a

non-aggression pact.

Now we shall produce a series of evidence to establish that for a period of several years, and especially after the seizure of Manchuria in 1931, Japan did everything she could to render the normal exploitation of the said railroad impossible and thus prepare the way for its seizure.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: If the Court please, on the last exhibit the prosecutor did not see fit to read it, and he made the statement that once more the document showed the Japanese Government refused to negotiate.

I ask your Honor to strike out that statement because the document does not show any such thing.

THE PRESIDENT: I take it you are referring to the exhibit last admitted, 747. If any part of the prosecutor's comment is not warranted by the document, we will disregard the comment to that extent. That is all I can say. None of us have had time to read more than a line or two of the document which extends over two pages.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: If the Tribunal please, I shall read the portion I have omitted just for the sake of expediency, because that portion just repeats the words which were mentioned in the previous document.

-

THE PRESIDENT: Proceed.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I am quoting the third paragraph on page 1.

"The Japanese Government evidently believes that the conclusion of non-aggression agreements is pertinent only between the two states which have no controversies.' To refute this idea the Japanese Government can only insist upon the Soviet Government's thorough deliberation of the statement contained in the verbal note of the Japanese Government which reads: 'To sum up, the formal beginning of the negotiations between the two governments in this case seems to be untimely.'"

Now I repeat my previous statement.

Now we shall produce evidence to establish that for a period of several years, and especially after the seizure of Manchuria in 1931, Japan did everything she could to render the normal exploitation of the Chinese Eastern Railroad impossible and thus prepare the way for its seizure.

The document submitted by Colonel Ivanov, my colleague in prosecution, exhibit No. 698, containing the plan of "Sabotage Activities against Russia" drawn up by the Japanese secret agent KANDA, Masatane, has established before the Tribunal the fact that even

1 2

 in 1927 sabotage activities and destruction of the railroad were planned to be carried out on the Chinese Eastern Railroad, and the Hunghutze were to be used for this purpose.

If the Court please, I offer evidence to corroborate the fact that railroad accidents, acts of sabotage, plunder and violence over the Soviet citizens, employees of the railroad, took place, these acts causing considerable damage to the railroad.

So as not to inconvenience the Tribunal with too much material, I present in evidence a list of malicious assaults on the Chinese Eastern Railroad which took place in April 1934 alone. This list was completed by Mr. Yang Shou-Chung, Chief of the General Affairs Section of the C.E.R.R., prosecution document No. 2306.

MR. McMANUS: If your Honor please, I would like to make an objection--

THE PRESIDENT: I will hear your objection in good time if you will come in good time.

MR. McMANUS: I beg your pardon?

THE PRESIDENT: I will hear your objection in good time if you come in good time. You may proceed with it.

MR. McMANUS: Did your Honor say that I might

proceed?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. McMANUS: I would just like my objection noted for the record, if the Court please, once again to the testifying of the prosecutor. I ask your Honor please, I mean, to instruct the prosecutor to limit his explanation. After all, there has been an opening statement. You do not need an opening statement for a paragraph or two. I object.

THE PRESIDENT: I have every sympathy with your objection, Mr. McManus, and I appeal to the prosecutors again to limit their descriptions and explanations to the barest minimum. That will not prevent the logical presentation and the clearest understanding of their case.

Mr. Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, I should like to have the Tribunal's direction on this matter. We are presenting a number of subject matters. To each one relates several, a number of pieces of evidence. For instance, General Tadevosyan has now been presenting evidence on the proposed non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Now, Mr. Golunsky, we will hear the balance of your explanation in the morning.

You can think it over. So may the defense. We will adjourn, now, until half past nine tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 15 October 1946, at 0930.)